HANDOUT HABITAT #1

Weighting Factors for Restoration Opportunity Area Step 2 Evaluation Criteria

Note: This handout presents the criteria, values, and weighting factors used to assess the extent of potential tidal restoration opportunities presented in Handout #3 for each of the ROAs.

1. Very high (federal/state highways) 1 2. Way require foods, powerlines, railroads, pipelines) 2. May require building of new levees 2. May require building of new levees 3. Moderate (few local roads) 4. Low 4. Low 4. Low 4. Low 4. Low 5. Level of likely difficulty to secure third party agreements (if necessary) to implement the restoration (e.g., require change in agencies policies/regulations; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost effective) 4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. Alow (small or no diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 3. Low (small or no diversions) 4. Low 4. Effect on locate relative to area 4. Low 4. Effects on locate relative to area 5. Low (small or no diversions) 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 7. Extent of adjacent lands suitable for 8. Mostly large parcels (160 acres) 1. Minimal 1	Step 2 Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Values	Criteria Value Weighting Factor
railroads, pipelines) 2. High (multiple local roads/powerlines) 3. Moderate (few local and sodds) 4. Low 5. Imile 3. None 5. Low 5. Low (lands in intertidal elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes district) 5. Impacts on the ability to divert water 4. Lift (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. Low 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. Low 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. Low (small or no diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. Low (small or no diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. Low (small or no diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 3. Low (small parcels (3. Low) 1. Many small parcels (2.160 acres) 1. Many small parcels (2.160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels 3. Low (and sin intertidal relevation of the parcels (2.160 acres) 4. Lift mile 5. Low (lands in intertidal relevation of the parcels (2.160 acres) 4. Lift mile 5. Low (lands in intertidal relevation of the parcels (2.160 acres) 4. Lift mile 5. Low (lands in intertidal relevation of the parcels (2.160 acres) 4. Lift mile 5. Low (lands in intertidal relevation of the parcels (2.160 acres) 4. Lift mile 5. Low (lands in intertidal relevation of the parcels (2.160 acres) 4. Lift mile 5. Low (lands in intertidal relevation	existing major infrastructure (roads, powerlines,	highways)	
3. Moderate (few local roads) 4. Low 6. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 1. High (project levees/powerlines) 2. Moderate (non-project levees/powerlines) 3. Low 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 3. Low (lands in intertidal elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes district) 5. Impacts on the ability to divert water 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. Low (small or no diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Low		2. High (multiple local	2
2. May require building of new levees 1. SI mile 1 2. 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		3. Moderate (few local	3
3. Level of likely difficulty to secure third party agreements (if necessary) to implement the restoration (e.g., require change in agencies policies/regulations; require legislative or congressional action; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost effective) 4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 3. Low (lands in intertidal elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes district) 5. Impacts on the ability to divert water 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 2. About an even mix of large and small parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Dove (1 and sin intertidal eleves/rations)			4
3. Level of likely difficulty to secure third party agreements (if necessary) to implement the restoration (e.g., require change in agencies policies/regulations; require legislative or congressional action; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost effective) 4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 1. High (project levees/railroads) 3. Low 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected)	2. May require building of new levees		
3. Level of likely difficulty to secure third party agreements (if necessary) to implement the restoration (e.g., require change in agencies policies/regulations; require legislative or congressional action; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost effective) 4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1		2. <1 mile	
agreements (if necessary) to implement the restoration (e.g., require change in agencies policies/regulations; require legislative or congressional action; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost effective) 4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Low		3. None	5
policies/regulations; require legislative or congressional action; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost effective) 4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. Wigh (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 3. Low (small or no diversions) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres)	agreements (if necessary) to implement the		1
contributions by a third party to make cost effective) 4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses 5. Impacts on the ability to divert water 1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected) 2. Moderate 1. Woderate 1. High (lands in intertidal elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes district) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 1. Large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 3. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 1. About an even mix of large and small parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres)	policies/regulations; require legislative or congressional action; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost		1
infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses Solution S		3. Low	1
adjacent land uses 2. Moderate 1 3. Low (lands in intertidal elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes district) 5. Impacts on the ability to divert water 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 1. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 2. About an even mix of large and small parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres)	infrastructure and functions, including drainage,	below msl/major portion of	1
elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes district) 5. Impacts on the ability to divert water 1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 3. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 2. About an even mix of large and small parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3			1
diversions to relocate relative to area) 2. Moderate 3. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 2. About an even mix of large and small parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres)		elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes	1
2. Moderate 1 3. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 2. About an even mix of large and small parcels 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3	5. Impacts on the ability to divert water	High (large number of diversions to relocate	1
diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion) 6. Number and size of parcels/landowners 1. Many small parcels (<160 acres) 2. About an even mix of large and small parcels 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3			1
(<160 acres) 2. About an even mix of large and small parcels 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3		diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion)	1
large and small parcels 3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres) 3	6. Number and size of parcels/landowners		1
3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres)		2. About an even mix of	2
		3. Mostly large parcels	3
	7. Extent of adjacent lands suitable for		1

HANDOUT HABITAT #1

transitional uplands	2. Potential for constraints	2
	in very long term	
	3. Substantial	3
8. Tidal connectivity	1. Low (constricted	1
	channels) 2. Moderate (connectivity,	
	but tides likely muted)	3
	but tides likely litated)	3
	3. High	5
9. Existing land uses of high economic value	1. High (>50% perennial	
	crops)	1
	2. Madausta (> 500/ migra	
	2. Moderate (>50% prime farmland/25-50% perennial	2
	crops)	2
	3. Low (<50% prime	
	farmland, <25% perennial	3
	crops)	
10. Existing conditions/land uses of high	1. High (lands managed for	1
ecological value	wildlife)	
	2. Low (common habitat within Delta)	3
11. Proximity to significant wastewater	May substantially affect	
discharge and diversion points	restored habitat values	1
	2. May have limited effect	1
	on restored habitat values	1
	3. Unlikely to affect	1
12 Provinity to important occupied species	restored habitat values 1. >1mile	
12. Proximity to important occupied species habitats (e.g., spawning areas, major	1. >111111e	1
outmigration corridors)/ Landscape position relative to existing patches of habitat and other	2. <1mile	3
	3. Within or adjacent to	
habitat restoration sites [combined these]		5
13. Estimated likelihood for complementary	1. Low	1
benefits upstream/downstream relative to other	2. Moderate	2
opportunities (e.g., good pathways for distributing organic carbon from restored marsh	3. High	3
to large portions of the Delta)	4. Very high	4
14. Synergies with other restoration planning	May conflict with other	
efforts	planning efforts	1
	2. No conflicts, potential	1
	minor benefits	
15. Affects in delta exports and water quality	3. Potential high synergies	1
	May degrade WQ No or minimal effect	1
	3. Likely enhances ability	1
16. Proportion that is public land/in	1. None	1
conservation easements that reasonably could be	2. <50%	3
made available for restoration	3. 50-75%	4
	4. >75%	5
17. Substantial fill or subsidence reversal likely	1. >20% requires fill	1
required	210-20% requires fill	3
	3. <10% requires fill	5

HANDOUT HABITAT #1

